

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,293	10/31/2003	Samuel J. Lewis	HES 2003-JP-011770U1	1381
28857 7	590 12/20/2004		EXAM	INER
CRAIG W. RODDY HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERVICES P.O. BOX 1431 DUNCAN, OK 73536-0440			MARCANTONI. PAUL D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1755	

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/698,293	LEWIS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Paul Marcantoni	1755				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI	LY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MON	TH(S) FROM				
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period 	.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30)) days will be considered timely.				
 Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	te, cause the application to become ABAND	ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 October 2004</u> .						
,						
	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1955 C.D. 11	1, 455 O.G. 215.				
Disposition of Claims	•					
4) Claim(s) 1,5-30 and 34-40 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,5-30 and 34-40</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.					
Application Papers	,					
	nor					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Of	fice Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
·	in priority under 35 H.S.C. & 11	9(a)-(d) or (f)				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received in Appli	cation No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri		eived in this National Stage				
application from the International Burea						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not rec	eived.				
Attachmont(c)		•				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Sumr	mary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/M	ail Date nal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	mai i atent Application (FTO-102)				

Application/Control Number: 10/698,293

Art Unit: 1755

Applicant's arguments filed 10/27/04 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

The applicants' amendment of claims necessitated the following new grounds of rejection and the prior art rejection is most as a result of this amendment:

Claims 1, 5-30, and 34-40 are rejected under 35 USC 102 (a and b) as anticipated, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Sugama '395, Gay et al. '295 B1, Neely Jr '661 B2, or Etherton (EP 1103533).

First, it is noted that applicants' broad preamble of "method of cementing" merely reads upon a method of mixing cement components because there is no requirement in this preamble that it is used for a well. The applicants cannot thus argue limitations not in their claims. While it is true that the claims may be read in light of the specification, it is improper to read the limitations of the specification into the claims. <u>In re Yamato</u>, 222 USPQ 93; <u>In re Wilson</u>, 149 USPQ 523; <u>Graver Tank v. Linde Air Products Co.</u> 80 USPQ 451 (Supreme Court).

Nevertheless, Sugama teaches a composition for wells comprising cement, hydrolyzed protein (col.3, line17), and surfactant (see col.3 for foam stablizers in lines 20-25 and col.4, line 9) thus anticipating the instant invention. Even if not anticipated, overlapping ranges of amounts would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Gay et al. '295 B1 teach a method of mixing a cement (ie a method of cementing) by mixing a binder such as cement (col.6, line 9), hydrolyzed protein foaming agent (col.5, second paragraph), and surfactant. Note that POLYOX or

Application/Control Number: 10/698,293

Art Unit: 1755

polyethylene oxide is one example of a surfactant which is the foam stabilizer (col.5, lines 30-35).

Neely Jr '661 B2 teach mixing an alkali metal silicate cement, wetting agent such as surfactanats including non-ionic, cationic, anionic, amphoteric, and zwitterionic (col.6, lines 40-50). Neely also teach the addition of hydrolyzed proteins (col.7 line 15) thus anticipating the instant invention. Even if not anticipated, overlapping ranges of amounts would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Etherton (EP 1103533 abstract) teach a process for cementing to make concrete by mixing cement with hydrolyzed protein and surfactant thus anticipating the instant invention. Even if not anticipated, overlapping ranges of amounts would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

It is the examiner's position that the prior art may differ because it does not teach a desired location to place the cement. Yet, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to find the proper place for set. (Note: Applicants should consider deleting the word "desired" because it has been held like "predetermined" to be an indefinite term and not proper in a claim-it also would not change the scope of the claim).

It is also noted that the additional additives are all conventional additives commonly employed in cementing and thus their addition would have been an obvious design choice for one of ordinary skill in the art for the compositions of the references above.

Application/Control Number: 10/698,293

Art Unit: 1755

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Marcantoni whose telephone number is 571-272-1373.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Bell, can be reached at 571-272-1362. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Application/Control Number: 10/698,293 Page 5

Art Unit: 1755

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul Marcantoni Primary Examiner Art Unit 1755